UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/714,730	11/17/2003	King-Hwa Lee	OIC0078US	4654

60975 7590 03/16/2010

CAMPBELL STEPHENSON LLP
11401 CENTURY OAKS TERRACE
BLDG. H, SUITE 250
AUSTIN, TX 78758

EXAMINER	
TANK, ANDREW L	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2175	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/16/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/714,730	LEE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ANDREW TANK	2175	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 October 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8,10-20 and 22-31* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8, 10-20, 22-31* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The following action is in response to the amendment filed October 21, 2009. Claims 1-6, 8, 11, 20, 24 and 25 have been directly amended. **Claims 1-8, 10-20 and 22-31** are pending and have been considered below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-8, 10-19 and 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1: Claim 1 recites the limitation “external business application” and “internal business application” in at least lines 2 and 4. However, Claim 1 further recites “causing the business application to execute the command”. It is unclear which business application is executing the command.

Claim 7: Claim 7 recites the limitation "the predefined query”. There is lack of sufficient antecedent basis in the claim for this limitation.

Claim 8: Claim 8 recites the limitation “the external business application”. There is lack of sufficient antecedent basis in the claim for this limitation. Further, claim 8 recites the limitations “the business application” and “the internal business application”. It is unclear if these are two separate entities or if they are the same business application.

Claim 11: Claim 11 recites the limitation "the external business application". There is lack of sufficient antecedent basis in the claim for this limitation. Further, claim 11 recites the limitations "the business application" and "the internal business application". It is unclear if these are two separate entities or if they are the same business application.

Claim 25: Claim 25 recites the limitation "the external business application". There is lack of sufficient antecedent basis in the claim for this limitation. Further, claim 25 recites the limitations "the business application" and "the internal business application". It is unclear if these are two separate entities or if they are the same business application.

Claim 31: Claim 31 recites the limitation "the predefined query". There is lack of sufficient antecedent basis in the claim for this limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2, 5-8, 10-13, 25-26 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by London et al. (US 5,831,609), previously presented as "London".

Claim 1: London discloses a method compromising:

providing information relating to an external business application (col 4 lines 50-51: "an application program is executed in its native environment") in a server system (col 3 lines 31-32: “the host computer is connected to the X-Terminals”), comprising:

receiving a request from an internal business application (col 4 lines 64-66: “translation software”, col 5 lines 23-25: “target GUI”), wherein the request comprises

an execute element (col 4 lines 65-67, col 5 lines 1-3: “alter the positioning”), and

an argument element (col 5 line 2: “of the application program’s window”),

the execute element is configured to cause the external business application to execute a command of the external business application (col 4 lines 65-67, col 5 lines 1-3: alter the position of the window in the native environment), and

the argument element comprises an indication of one or more user interface elements that are to be returned (col 5 lines 2-3: the window);

generating a data element by causing the business application to execute the command (col 5 lines 26-28: “converts the API command to a command of the X-protocol, e.g., a command from the Xlib library")

generating the one or more user interface elements (col 5 lines 25-34), wherein the one or more user interface elements correspond to a subset of user interface elements provided by the external business application (col 4 lines 64-66: “evaluates whether the command represented by the API call is window

management related", limits the interface elements to that of the windows), and the subset is selected according to the argument element (col 5 lines 2-3: the window is selected to be repositioned, the window is a subset of the UI elements); and

sending a response to the internal business application, comprising the one or more user interface elements and the data (col 5 lines 29-34).

Claim 8: London discloses a method in a server system for providing application information, the method compromising:

providing transforms for transforming output of the business application, each transform having a name (col 4 lines 46-66: translation software transforms commands related to windows management);

receiving a request from an internal business application (col 4 lines 64-66: "translation software", col 5 lines 23-25: "target GUI"), wherein the request comprises

an execute element (col 4 lines 65-67, col 5 lines 1-3: "alter the positioning"), and

an argument element (col 5 line 2: "of the application program's window"),

the execute element is configured to cause the external business application to execute a command of the external business application (col 4 lines 65-67, col 5 lines 1-3: alter the position of the window in the native environment), and

the argument element comprises an indication of one or more user interface elements that are to be returned (col 5 lines 2-3: the window), and the argument element optionally indicates the name of a transform to be applied to the out put of the business application (col 5 lines 26-28: "the translation software converts the API command to a command of the X-Protocol");

generating a data element by causing the business application to execute the command (col 5 lines 26-28: “converts the API command to a command of the X-protocol, e.g., a command from the Xlib library")

generating the one or more user interface elements (col 5 lines 25-34), wherein the one or more user interface elements correspond to a subset of user interface elements provided by the external business application (col 4 lines 64-66: “evaluates whether the command represented by the API call is window management related”, limits the interface elements to that of the windows), and the subset is selected according to the argument element (col 5 lines 2-3: the window is selected to be repositioned, the window is a subset of the UI elements);

generating a generated output comprising the data element and the user interface element (col 5 lines 33-34);

when argument element indicates the name of a transform,

generating a transformed output by applying the provided transform with the indicated name to the generated output (col 5 lines 33-34); and

otherwise, sending to the client system the generated output (col 5 lines 33-34).

Claim 25: London discloses a method in a server system for providing application information, the method comprising:

receiving a request from an internal business application (col 4 lines 64-66: "translation software", col 5 lines 23-25: "target GUI"), wherein the request comprises

an execute element (col 4 lines 65-67, col 5 lines 1-3: "alter the positioning"), and

an argument element (col 5 line 2: "of the application program's window"),

the execute element is configured to cause the external business application to execute a command of the external business application (col 4 lines 65-67, col 5 lines 1-3: alter the position of the window in the native environment), and

the argument element comprises an indication of one or more user interface elements that are to be returned (col 5 lines 2-3: the window),

generating a data element by causing the business application to execute the command (col 5 lines 26-28: "converts the API command to a command of the X-protocol, e.g., a command from the Xlib library")

when the argument element indicates to return the one or more user interface elements,

generating the one or more user interface elements (col 5 lines 25-34), wherein the one or more user interface elements correspond to a subset of user interface elements provided by the external business application (col 4 lines 64-66: "evaluates whether the command represented by the API call is window management related", limits the interface elements to that of the windows), and the subset is selected according to the argument element (col 5 lines 2-3: the window is selected to be repositioned, the window is a subset of the UI elements); and,

sending a first response to the client system a response that comprises the at least the one or more user interface elements and the data element (col 5 lines 65-67, col 6 line 1); and

otherwise (col 5 lines 48-52),

sending a second response to the client system comprising the generated data element without the one or more user interface elements (col 5 lines 65-67, col 6 line 1).

Claims 11 and 12: London discloses a method in a server system for providing information relating to a business application, the method comprising:

providing a default format for output of the business application (col 6 lines 63-65);

receiving a request from an internal business application (col 4 lines 64-66: "translation software", col 5 lines 23-25: "target GUI"), wherein the request comprises

an execute element (col 4 lines 65-67, col 5 lines 1-3: “alter the positioning”), and

an argument element (col 5 line 2: “of the application program’s window”),

the execute element is configured to cause the external business application to execute a command of the external business application (col 4 lines 65-67, col 5 lines 1-3: alter the position of the window in the native environment), and

the argument element comprises an indication of one or more user interface elements that are to be returned (col 5 lines 2-3: the window), and the argument element optionally indicates a user agent format or a client-specified format for the output of the business application (col 6 lines 56-58);

selecting a format giving preference in the following order: the client-specified format, the user-agent format, and the default format (col 6 lines 54-65)

generating a data element by causing the business application to execute the command (col 5 lines 26-28: “converts the API command to a command of the X-protocol, e.g., a command from the Xlib library")

generating the one or more user interface elements (col 5 lines 25-34), wherein the one or more user interface elements correspond to a subset of user interface elements provided by the external business application (col 4 lines 64-66: “evaluates whether the command represented by the API call is window management related”, limits the interface elements to that of the windows), and

the subset is selected according to the argument element (col 5 lines 2-3: the window is selected to be repositioned, the window is a subset of the UI elements);

sending a response in the selected format to the internal business application, comprising the data element and the one or more user interface (col 5 lines 31-34).

Claims 2 and 26: London discloses the remote business application server system method as in claims 1 and 25 above respectively, and London further discloses wherein the argument element of the command indicates a type of user interface element to return (col 4 lines 5-6).

Claims 5 and 29: London discloses the remote business application server system method as in claims 1 and 25 above respectively, and London further discloses wherein the argument element of the command comprises an "SWEDataOnly" argument, that is, when this argument is TRUE only data elements are returned and when this argument is FALSE both data and user interface elements are returned (col 5 lines 40-60).

Claims 6 and 30: London discloses the remote business application server system method as in claims 1 and 25 above respectively, and London further discloses wherein the argument element of the command includes a "SWEExclude" argument (col 5 lines 40-60).

Claims 7 and 31: London discloses the remote business application server system method as in claims 1 and 25 above respectively, and London further discloses

receiving a list of predefined queries in response to the request, wherein the list of predefined queries comprises the predefined query (col 5 lines 34-36).

Claim 10: London discloses the remote business application server system method as in claim 8 above, and London further discloses wherein the argument element of the command includes a "SWEXslStyleSheet" argument (col 5 lines 40-60).

Claim 13: London discloses the remote business application server system method as in claim 11 above, and London further discloses the user-agent format being based on a type of user agent specified in the request (col 2 lines 60-64).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 20 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bookman et al., (US 5,761,673), previously presented as Bookman.

Claims 20: Bookman discloses a computer-readable medium containing instructions, executable on a computer system, configured to execute a command, represented by a command block, of a business application, and a data structure defining the command block, wherein the command block is inbound to a web server, and the web server is

configured to execute on the computer system (col 3 lines 61-62: "Web server environment, containing conventional objects"), the data structure comprising:

an execute element having a path attribute indicating a location of an object manager (col 4 lines 1-2: "Web server executable");

a command element nested within the execute element and having a value attribute indicating a name of the command (col 4 lines 2-3: "Web browser makes an object request from Web server executable", col 4 lines 5-6: "a table in database, based on the object request URL"); and

one or more argument elements nested within the command element, wherein each argument element comprises a name attribute indicating a name of an argument for the named command (col 3 lines 64-65: "each object has an attribute associated with it"), the one or more argument elements being from a set of argument elements comprising an argument element configured to indicate a response markup format (col 4 line 7: "an HTML file"), an argument element to configured to indicate whether the response should include user interface elements (col 4 line 7: "an HTML file"), and an arguments element configured to identify a transform to be applied to output (col 4 lines 9-12: "CGI script"). Bookman further discloses that the web server environment contains a multitude of computers (col 1 lines 12-14) and programs (col 1 lines 22-24). Data is supplied to and from the computers and servers (col 1 lines 44-52). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art and the teachings of Bookman before them at the time the present invention was made to apply the known technique of a network of computers and a server and passing of information between them, taught by

Bookman, improve the similar device taught by Bookman above to yield the predictable result of expanding Bookman's device above to further contain a plurality of instructions executable on a plurality of computer systems and configured to execute a plurality of commands on a plurality of business applications according to the data structures and methods of Bookman above.

Bookman further discloses wherein the argument element is configured to select a subset of user interface elements when the argument element indicates that the response should comprise user interface elements (col 4 lines 1-3: "makes an object request .. in a table database"), or select an empty set of user interface elements when the argument element indicates the response should not comprise user interface elements (col 5 lines 30-32: "each procedure or function may have zero or more parameters..").

Claim 22: Bookman discloses a computer-readable medium as in claim 20 above, and further disclose that zero or more occurrences of the command elements are nested within the execute element. Bookman discloses that a command element is nested within the execute element, therefore, the command elements, when they do occur (one), are nested within the execute element and, when they do not occur (zero), occur nowhere (col 3 lines 61-67, col 4 lines 1-12).

Claim 23: Bookman discloses the computer-readable medium as in claim 20 above, but do not specifically disclose that only one command element is nested within the execute element. However, Bookman does disclose a command element nested within the execute element (col 3 lines 61-67, col 4 lines 1-12). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made to include only one command element within the execute element. One would have been motivated to only include one command element when only one command element was needed, in order to save processing time and increase the efficiency and speed with which the processor operates.

Claims 3-4, 14-19 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over London.

Claims 3 and 27: London discloses the remote business application server system method as in claims 1 and 25 above respectively, but does not specifically disclose that the argument element indicates which type of user interface elements to not return. However, London does disclose the request indicating a type of user interface element to return (col 4 lines 5-6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made that if one could return types of elements, one could also not return those elements. One would have been motivated to not return these elements in order to provide the server system with only specific elements, thereby limiting the amount of processes required and raising the efficiency of the processor.

Claims 4 and 28: London discloses the remote business application server system method as in claims 3 and 27 above respectively, but does not specifically disclose that the type of user interface elements to not return are navigation data. However, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made would know that user

interface elements of typical applications include menu bars, toolbars, backgrounds, colors, forms, shapes, navigational information, etc. Therefore, it would have been obvious one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made to not return one of these elements. One would have been motivated to not return these elements in order to provide the server system with only specific elements, thereby limiting the amount of processes required and raising the efficiency of the processor.

Claim 14: London discloses the remote business application server system method as in claim 13 above, but do not specifically disclose that the type of user agent specified is a type of browser. However, London discloses the host application that the user wishes to use being "MICROSOFT EXCEL" or "WORD FOR WINDOWS" (col 2 lines 60-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made that London's list of host applications could be expanded to include programs such as "MICROSOFT POWERPOINT" or "MICROSOFT INTERNET EXPLORER", the later being a web browser. One would be motivated to include these in order to provide the remote user with more options for applications to run in their native GUI system.

Claims 15-18: London discloses the remote business application server system method as in claim 11 above, but does not specifically disclose the formats are a markup language. However, London does disclose the use of the X-Protocol to generate an output (col 5 line 25-26). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made would know that what is written one programming language can also be written in another programming language such as C, C++, HTML, JavaScript, X-

Protocol, XML, WML, etc. One would have been motivated to use a markup language in order to have a result more compatible with web-based applications.

Claim 19: London discloses the remote business application server system method as in claim 11 above, but do not specifically disclose the request including a "SWESetMarkup" argument that specifies the client-specified format as being XML, HTML, or WML. However, London does disclose the use of the X-Protocol to generate an output (col 5 line 25-26) as well disclosing the host application that the client wishes to use being "MICROSOFT EXCEL" or "WORD FOR WINDOWS" (col 2 lines 60-64). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made would realize that London's list of host applications could be expanded to include programs such as "MICROSOFT POWERPOINT" or "MICROSOFT INTERNET EXPLORER", the later being a web browser. In the case of "MICROSOFT INTERNET EXPLORER" being the application the client wishes to use, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention that the original programming could be written in a more web-friendly language such as HTML, XML, WML, or JavaScript. One would be motivated to do this in order to provide the client system with more selection in applications to use, as well as providing a result that is more compatible in the case of web-based applications.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bookman in view of Hallberg et al., "Using Microsoft Excel 97", published by Que Corporation, copyright 1997 Que Corporation, previously presented as "Hallberg".

Claim 24: Bookman discloses a computer-readable medium containing: instructions executable on a computer system, configured to execute a command, represented by a command block, of a business application; and

a data structure defining the command block, wherein the command block is outbound to a web server and the web server is configured to execute on the computer system (col 3 lines 61-62: "Web server environment, containing conventional objects", col 4 lines 12-13: "back to requesting Web browser"), the data structure comprising:

an application element (col 1 lines 56-57: "CGI is a standard interface for running external programs on a Web server.", col 3 lines 62-63: "an object") having a name attribute (col 3 lines 65-66: "each object has an attribute associated with it that identifies the type of object");

a navigation element nested within the application element, having a name attribute (col 4 lines 6: "based on the object request URL"), and

an argument element, indicating a subset of one or more user interface elements (col 4 lines 1-3: "makes an object request .. in a table database"),

Bookman does not specifically disclose that the navigation element has sub-elements from a set comprising a menu element, tool bar element, screen bar element, thread bar element, view bar element, and page item element. Bookman does disclose "Web browsers" (col 1 lines 36-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made that "Web browsers" include: menus, tool bars, screen bars, view bars, etc. One would have been motivated to disclose the

navigation element having these standard browser sub-elements in order to allow the user greater flexibility in the browser they chose to use.

While Bookman discloses one or more elements from the set of elements including an argument element to configured to indicate whether the response should include user interface elements from a subset of one or more user interface elements (col 3 lines 65-67, col 4 lines 1-7: “an HTML file”),Bookman does not specifically disclose one or more elements from the set of elements including a screen element, an applet element, and a form element, the one or more elements being nested within the application element and each having a name attribute. However, Bookman do disclose Web browsers requesting particular hypermedia documents (col 1 lines 45-67, col 2 lines 1-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made to allow applet scripts, forms, and URL queries to be nested within the web browser. One would have been motivated to do this in order to provide dynamic hypermedia to an end-user, thereby increasing the user interactivity. Bookman does not specifically disclose that the data structure is an XML document. However, Bookman do disclose the use of object requests from Web server executables (col 4 lines 2-3) and the use of HTML (col 4 lines 45-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made that the data structure to be used in a Web based situation could also be written in XML, WML, HTML, JavaScript, CGI Script, etc. One would be motivated to write it in XML in order to benefit from a more database oriented programming language.

Bookman does not specifically disclose a predefined query bar element nested within the application element. Hallberg discloses that Microsoft Excel is a spreadsheet program with database functionality (page 383: "Building Excel Databases"). This functionality includes the ability to selectively filter list results, i.e. query the database to return results based on a predefined filter, used in bars (page 394: "AutoFilter", Fig. 14.9). Further, Hallberg discloses that Microsoft Excel files can be opened using a web browser (page 638: "The file will open within Internet Explorer, and you can edit it just as if you had opened it in Excel directly.") Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art and the teachings of Bookman and Hallberg before them at the time the present invention was made, to use the business application Microsoft Excel, complete with the database functionality and predetermined query bars, in the business application interface server system disclosed by Bookman. One would have been motivated to allow a user to use Microsoft Excel while in a web browser, in particular the database functionality of Excel, in order to better manage data, as suggested by Hallberg (page 383: "organizing your data").

Bookman further discloses that the web server environment contains a multitude of computers (col 1 lines 12-14) and programs (col 1 lines 22-24). Data is supplied to and from the computers and servers (col 1 lines 44-52). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art and the teachings of Bookman and Hallberg before them at the time the present invention was made to apply the known technique of a network of computers and a server and passing of information between them, taught by Bookman, improve the similar device suggested by Bookman and

Hallberg above to yield the predictable result of expanding Bookman and Hallberg's device above to further contain a plurality of instructions executable on a plurality of computer systems and configured to execute a plurality of commands on a plurality of business applications according to the data structures and methods of Bookman and Hallberg above.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed October 21, 2009, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues (pages 12-14), with regards to claims 1-8, 10-19, and 25-31, that London fails to teach or suggest generating one or more user interface elements corresponding to a subset of user interface elements provided by an external business application; and that the subset is selected according to an argument element in a request from an internal business application.

The Examiner notes that on closer reading of London, a new interpretation of the reference has given rise to the new grounds of anticipatory rejections of the amended claims above.

Particularly, London clearly discloses a subset of user interface elements (windows management) provided by the external business application (i.e. the native environment) and that the subset is selected according to the argument element (the window for translating is indicated in the argument element). London does not blindly

translate the entire GUI as indicated by the Applicant. London clearly defines subsets of elements to transform, as in the example of windows management (the elements are windows).

Applicant argues (15-18), with regards to claims 20, 22 and 23, that Bookman fails to teach or suggest selecting either a subset of an empty set of user interface elements and that the subset or empty set is selected according to an argument element in a request form from an internal business application. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Bookman clearly indicates that the argument element selects a subset of interface elements when the indicated that the response should comprising elements (col 4 lines 2-3: “makes an object request from Web server executable"), and selects an empty set when the response should not compromise elements (col 5 lines 30-32: “each procedure or function may have zero or more parameters..”), as claimed in claim 20.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant’s invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the claimed invention allows an internal business application to integrate the selected subset of output of an external business application) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANDREW TANK whose telephone number is (571)270-1692. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on (571)272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. T./
Examiner, Art Unit 2175
March 13, 2010

/William L. Bashore/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175